SUBJECT No. 49.

Thumb impressions.

Messrs. Sitharamaiya and Linge Gowda, Chikanayakanhalli taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The existing rules do not render the affixing of thumb marks compulsory where persons taking documents for registration refuse to do so. This gives room for fraud in cases in which the executant and the identifying witness are both illiterate. Orders may therefore be passed rendering it obligatory to affix thumb impressions when documents are presented for registration.

Reply of Government.—The present rule is all right and requires no change.

SUBJECT No. 50.

Visitors to lock-ups and lock-up officers.

Messrs. K. S. Santanam Iyengar, Closepet municipality, and T. Ramachandra Rao and K. Puttappa, Bangalore District Board.

Summary of discussion.—With a view to reduce cases of ill treatment of the accused while in police custody, a visitors' book may be maintained in every lock-up and respectable non-official gentlemen allowed to visit the lock-ups and note in the book any injuries that they may notice on the person of the accused and bring them to the notice of the local medical authority.

Reply of Government.—Not feasible for the present.

SUBJECT No. 51.

Separate lock-ups for females.

Messrs. Padmanna and K. Venkatasamaiya, Nanjangud taluk.

Summary of discussion.—There are no separate police lock-ups for male and female prisoners in many taluk headquarter stations. So it is prayed that separate lock-ups be constructed at an early date.

Reply of Government.—Will be done as far as possible. It is a question of funds.

SUBJECT No. 52.

Establishment of a reformatory school.

Mr. B. Venkatasamanna, Chitaldrug municipality.

Summary of discussion.—A reformatory school may be established for training of juvenile offenders.

Reply of Government.—There is no necessity at present. The question will be considered if there is any increase in the number of juvenile prisoners.

SUBJECT No. 53.

Investigation Centre Scheme.

(1) Messrs. B. Narasinga Rao, Seringapatam taluk; B. Ramanna, Krishnarajpete taluk; G. Narasimhachar and Ganjam Venkataramana Setti, T. Narsipur taluk; Narain Setti and Venkataramanagowda, Kankanhalli taluk.

(2) Mr. Santhanam Iyengar, Closepet municipality.

Summary of discussion.—(1) The Investigation Centre Scheme is based no doubt on a sound principle that low paid subordinates should be deprived of the power to investigate cases, but it has not succeeded in carrying the principle to any appreciable extent. The pay of the Police Jamadars is still very low. The present method of investigation is by no means an improvement on its predecessor in important particulars. Delay in the receipt of information and the consequent delay in the arrival of the investigating officer at the scene of crime generally afford facilities for suppressing the true state of facts and substituting altogether a different story. The Police Daffadars who receive the first information feel no sort of responsibility in the matter and are indifferent towards the progress of the investigation. It is, therefore, prayed that improvements be affected to remedy the above defects.